

IN THE DRAWINGS

Figure 4 has been amended as indicated in red in the attached annotated marked-up drawing. A replacement sheet of Figure 4 is also attached.

REMARKS

All of the formal objections have been cured.

Claim 8 has been amended to include the subject matter of former dependent claim 11 without intervening dependent claims. Claim 11 was rejected under Section 102 based on Vila.

Claim 8, as amended, calls for holding the data packets until each of the buffers has a predefined depth.


The claim is rejected on the material on the bottom of column 7 and the top of column 8 of Vila. That material does talk about a situation in which a buffer has received a number of data symbols that exceed a maximum number. But this is solely done to determine if alignment or deskewing is just not possible. There is no effort to hold the data packets until each of the buffers has a predetermined depth. Instead, what is done in the cited reference is if a given buffer, as opposed to each of the buffers, has a maximum size, then the deskewing operation is abandoned.

Thus, the difference is that there is no effort in the cited reference to hold the data packets until each of the buffers has a predetermined depth. Instead, the reference simply uses a time out function on the deskewing, the time out determined by when a buffer reaches some predetermined maximum size and this is used as an indication that deskewing will not be possible.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2007



Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation



400 →




FIG. 4